



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A FUNCTIONALIZED EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT AS A FACTOR IN INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY

BY ERNEST MARTIN HOPKINS,

Manager, Employment Department, The Curtis Publishing Company,
Philadelphia.

The most significant fact pertaining to industrial management today is the attention which is being given to the problems of personnel. Recognition is being given to the truth that new sources of power and evolution of mechanical processes have but changed the points, in methods of production, at which the human factor is essential, without changing to any degree the ultimate dependence upon it.

The impressive thing is not that some men recognize the importance of the individual worker, for this has always been true of some; it is that such recognition is so rapidly becoming general, since it has been so long delayed. Yet the causes are obvious. Power can be produced for A and Z with little variation in cost to either. Plant design has been standardized until one can gain small advantage over another herein. The same mechanical equipment can be secured by one as by the other. There is no longer marked advantage possible to the thoroughly progressive house over another, equally progressive and intelligent, in the securing of raw materials, in the mechanical processes of manufacture, or in the methods of promotion and distribution. Wherein lies possible advantage of A over Z in the competition between them? Or the question may read for Z, how may he retain his prosperity in competition with A? This is one phase of the compelling logic which is leading to the study of problems of employment.

It becomes increasingly evident that the statement frequently made is universally true, if interpreted broadly, that the interests of employer and employee are inextricably bound together.

The social significance of questions relating to the mutual interests of employers and employees is so great that these could not have been much longer kept subordinate under any circumstances; but the utilitarian advantage to employers, individually

and collectively, of scientific study of these problems has become so plain that the present general interest in them among industrial leaders can most positively be ascribed to the fact that, whatever else they are, they are a vital concern of good business.

It was logical, when industrial management reached the stage that its practices could be defined, and the preliminary studies made to separate the good and the bad, in course of reducing such management to a science, that attention should have been focussed first on processes, machines and buildings. These things needed to be right before the worker could realize his possibilities. It is to be recognized, however, that though the word "efficiency" came into wide use during this stage of dealing with inanimate factors, the word is entitled to the far broader significance which carries an import of all-around effectiveness. Industrial efficiency, under proper definition, does mean and must be understood to mean right workers and right conditions for them as distinctly as right machines and conditions designed for their best operation.

This is the broad principle on which the functionalized employment department has been established. It is simply the application of the same reasoning to finding and maintaining the labor supply that has already been applied in industry to problems of building, equipment, mechanical supervision, and the methods by which business is despatched.

There is this greater difficulty in establishing a functionalized department for employment and correlated responsibilities than in establishing a department for almost anything else, that however frankly men will acknowledge limitations on some sides, few will admit or believe that they are not particularly perspicacious in their judgments of men. This is particularly true of those of circumscribed vision, whose advantages have been few and whose opportunities for developing breadth in their mental processes have been limited, as is the case with many minor executives or subforemen. Such an one feels, perhaps not unnaturally, that his prestige with the new employee is impaired if employment is secured through some department outside his own. Moreover, he is likely to ascribe to the employment department no other basis of appraisal than he himself has used, and with this as a premise, he argues that his own intuition is better than that of one who lacks his own intimate knowledge of the work for which he is responsible.

Almost invariably, too, he fails to value to reasonable extent the loss to his own work which comes from the waste of time involved in interviewing and employing, even if he undertakes to do this with such care as that of which he may be capable.

Too much emphasis may not be placed, however, on the difficulties incident to establishing the employment department, for the foremost concerns have so definitely accepted the principle that it is bound to be accepted generally. It should simply be recognized that such a department cannot fulfill its function to become a large contributor to the success of the business unless it be given recognition and endorsement sufficient to gain for it coöperation from the departments with whose problems of personnel it must be in contact. A large responsibility rests upon the employment department to work carefully and considerately, with open mind and appreciation of the problems of others; but even so, occasional support in the way of instructions from above will be needed to give the department access to some parts of the field wherein its work should be done.

This raises the question as to the place of the department in the organization. There can be only one answer, if the installation of the work is made in good faith—it must be in direct contact with the topmost management, where its problems can be passed upon promptly and decisively by ultimate authority, if issues arise. More important than this, the creation and establishment of such a department in a business should mean that the avenues of communication between those in the ranks and those at the top, which too often have become closed as a business has grown large, are to be re-opened. If this does not become true, the potentiality for good in such work can never be more than partially realized.

It is a duty that distinctly belongs to the employment office, to cultivate sympathetic knowledge of the opinions of workers and to bespeak these to the management. All industry is so set up that the word of the management can be quickly and easily transmitted down. It is no less of consequence to those above than to those below that some agency exists for facilitating the reverse process.

Industrial efficiency could not have been so definitely advanced as it has been without gigantic accomplishment in gathering data, codifying it, and the establishment of systems to realize benefits from the lessons learned. It is useless to expect that great businesses

can be conducted without a great mass of prescribed routines designed for the greatest good in the majority of cases. But it is true that the necessary struggle for uniformity and system has involved the limitation of individualism to standardized types to an extent that raises some serious questions.

It is impossible to set limits to the advantages which may accrue to a business from such attributes of personality among its men as loyalty and enthusiasm, and yet personality cannot well be standardized. Herein the employment department needs particularly to be on guard in its own work. It must steer between the danger of following the foreman's method of picking men because he likes their looks or their manners, and a method so systematized and impersonal as to have eliminated all individualism.

It is for this reason that great caution is needed to avoid blind acceptance of methods from among the various systems evolved by the less careful industrial psychologists or advocates of character analysis. Much along these lines has been established which ought to be known and utilized to reasonable extent in the employment office. It is surely true that certain physical types are particularly adapted to certain forms of manual labor; it is as true that certain mental types have especial aptitudes which ought to be recognized in assigning them to work. Experimental psychology has taught us how to determine the mental defective and the moron, and is capable of doing far more for us. But there is a refinement of system proposed by some that is neither commercially profitable nor ethically sound, in that on the one hand, at large expense, it attempts the standardization of personality, and on the other, it accepts unduly a theory of predestination which would largely limit the opportunities for proving individual worth.

There are, however, no differences of opinion concerning the desirability of standardization of jobs. This is not properly a responsibility of the employment office, but knowledge of what the respective standards are is one of its vital needs. If the data have not been gathered and made available, one of the most essential moves for the employment office in the establishment of its own work is to undertake such a survey of requirements of the work and opportunities for the workers in the respective departments and sub-departments as brought together will give a composite of the whole plant. Such a survey need not be made obtrusively nor need it

become a nuisance to department executives. It will necessarily involve the expenditure of considerable time. But it is worth while doing, even if it has to be done very quietly and very slowly, for while it offers the most fundamental data for employment work, it likewise often shows such inconsistencies in practice that a company can markedly raise its average of efficiency, if only it brings the departments of lax or faulty standards somewhat up towards the grades of those which are being well administered.

Such a survey in its elementary form should show at least such facts concerning the respective departments as preferred sources of supply for new employees, education or special training required, any special attributes desired, initial wages paid, opportunities for advancement in position and possible wage increases, working conditions and working hours, and labor turn-over.

The term "labor turn-over," which has recently come into general use, even now is not fully understood by some, and is perhaps best described by the more brutal phrase in general use, "hiring and firing." The annual "hiring and firing" figures represent the percentage of labor turn-over. For instance, if a company maintains a normal labor force of a thousand people, and is obliged to employ annually a thousand to compensate for those who leave or are dismissed, the labor turn-over is 100 per cent.

Probably no greater argument for the establishment of a functionalized employment department in many companies could be made than to induce a study of the labor turn-over figures. It is not an unusual experience to find employers who estimate the figures of their own concerns at less than 50 per cent, when it actually runs to several times that figure.

It is to be noted that such figures, though illuminating in themselves, need further analysis to be of major use. For instance, seasonal demands may be such in the specified shop normally enrolling a thousand hands that two hundred must be employed periodically for a few weeks and then dismissed, their places again to be filled in a few more weeks. If this happens five times a year, the turn-over figures will be 500 per cent. The other extreme would be a concern with such lack of knowledge of the money loss involved in change that practically every job was vacated and filled at least annually, when likewise the labor turn-over would be 100 per cent. Such figures are much too high, but they are not infre-

quent. They likewise are expensive, but while in the latter case the concern in question would bear much of the expense, in the former it is more largely imposed upon the community. Working men or working women who, through no fault of their own, are deprived successively, time on time, of the opportunities to realize their earning capacities, inevitably suffer impairment of courage, self-respect, and even moral fibre, the loss of which falls first upon the community, but eventually upon industry, in the depreciation in quality and spirit of the labor supply.

It is extremely difficult to know what can be done to remove the seasonal element in employment needs in the majority of cases. On the other hand, much would be gained if, by analysis and comparison, foremen and sub-managers could be shown the futility and financial loss of the lack of comprehension which allows them to discharge carelessly on caprice, or for the maintenance of that perverted sense of discipline which they phrase as "keeping the fear of God in the hearts of their people."

There is so much advantage in having employees who know the ways and routines of a concern that it would seem that, except where dismissals are for sufficient cause, those suffering them would be preferred applicants for positions elsewhere in the company calling for like grade of ability. It is not often so, nevertheless, except where a well-established employment office or its equivalent exists. All too frequently, a reduction of work in one department of a large manufacturing plant will send workers out under dismissal, while some other department of the same plant is seeking additional help.

A rule which has been established in some large plants, and which has worked advantageously, is that no department can discharge an individual from the company's employ; it can only dismiss from its own work. In effect, this subjects the case to review of some higher official who holds the power of final discharge, gives the employment office a chance to utilize the experienced employee elsewhere, if of proved capacity, and acts as a healthy check on the impulsive high-handedness of certain types of foremen and sub-managers. Another rule which works to somewhat the same effect is to require advance notices to be filed with the employment office concerning projected dismissals, together with the reasons therefor.

Other statistics which will interest the progressive employer may be compiled, showing the degree of permanency of the labor

force—thus, the percentages showing what proportion of the total enrollment has been employed less than a year, what proportion for between one and two years, and so on. Not infrequently it will be found that these figures reveal employment conditions quite apart from the theories of the head of the house and contrary to his belief as to how his business is being run. A manufacturer employing about four thousand men told me recently that he had genuinely believed that a large proportion of his men had been with him from ten to twenty years, only to find from such a statistical table that 50 per cent had been there less than two and a half years.

Incidentally, it may be suggested that some of the easy generalizations which have been made from time to time in regard to the lack of stability of workingmen as groups, because of the presence therein of so-called "floaters," would be materially altered if it could be known to what extent it had been beyond the volition of workmen of unquestioned skill to remain permanently placed. In general, the handling of dismissals has been dictated by the intelligence of sub-executives rather than by the intelligence of the management, and there has been no supervision from above.

The functionalized employment department is dependent, for successful accomplishment, in particularly specific ways upon the smoothness with which its work can be made to articulate with other functionalized departments, such, for instance, as the accounting department, the schedule or routing department, and other like ones. It must rely on these for the data to prove much of its own work, and in turn it may find within its perspective facts highly important to them. Through the large number of its interviews, it should come to have an unusually comprehensive knowledge of current rates of wages for established grades of work. It ought, furthermore, to come into position to know to what extent the law of increasing returns will apply to additional rates of pay established to secure superior ability.

It is probably due to the fact that the attention of industrial leaders has been fixed in the past so intently on problems of power, plants, and machines that so little practical recognition has been given to the fact that the most efficient worker, even at considerably increased cost, is far and away the most profitable. The most obvious demonstration of this exists perhaps in the case of a shop filled with expensive machinery working to full capacity, yet with

its production falling behind its orders. Would there be any hesitancy if its management could have an option offered between added efficiency and enthusiasm among its employees that would increase its potentiality a half through the enrollment of its labor force on the basis of capability to earn a largely increased wage, and the alternative of the necessity of adding 50 per cent to its plant and mechanical equipment? The truth is that seemingly there is not yet any general understanding among employers that a high gross payroll does not necessarily result from a high individual wage, or expressed in slightly different terms, that the cost per unit of production may be larger the lower the rate of pay to the individual worker.

A somewhat analagous principle is involved in the matter of working hours per day. The old-time practice indicated a theory that if so much work could be accomplished by a working-week of sixty hours, 20 per cent more could be accomplished in a working week of seventy-two hours. Reduce these figures to fifty hours a week as compared to sixty, and the theory does not seem to have been so completely discarded even now. Yet the facts are available from modern investigations of the physical and nervous reactions from fatigue, lack of variety incident to refinements of methods in specialization, and want of time for recuperative processes, to show that up to some definite limit actual gross production may increase under reduction of hours; or that up to some other limit a much larger proportionate production per hour of work may be secured. Moreover, these arguments have been proved again and again in the actual operations of progressive companies.

It is not to be understood that the employment department does have or should have final authority to govern these policies. But the department is in a position to study and compile data regarding these problems as very few other departments can; and either in initiating or contributing to investigations of all such matters affecting the human relations, it has opportunity for rendering the most valuable kind of staff service to the general administration and to departments associated with itself.

Industrial efficiency, with all its vital importance, is yet a means to an end, and not the end itself. It is the quality or manner by which a highly desirable result is to be accomplished, but it is not the result. It has too often happened that an earnest advocate

of efficient methods has become so engrossed in the technique of his profession as to ignore its purpose, to the consequent detriment of the general cause.

So it may be too easily with functionalized employment work. An office may be set up under the direction of a master of system, which in its operation shall be a model of method. Interviewing of applicants filling out of skillfully devised application blanks and filing them, and creation of numberless card records may be so conducted as to show these things to have been reduced to an exact science, and yet the value of the department remain problematical.

Of course, no effort must be spared to have the ways devised by which the best possible candidates shall be offered and chosen for the respective kinds of work. But the work is incomplete if it stops here. The good of the business is the criterion by which all accomplishment must be judged. If a high grade of labor has been secured, the company's interests demand that the environment, the conditions and the opportunities shall be made such as to hold it. The employment department cannot omit any legitimate effort to influence policies to this end. It must work helpfully and understandingly with other departments, without pride or arrogance. But it must work unceasingly with clear vision toward the goal of making its distinct contribution to the company's prosperity through the improved human relationships which it may help to develop.